

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION**

**RAYMOND JAMES & ASSOCIATES,
INC., ET AL.**

PLAINTIFFS

V.

CAUSE NO. 3:19-CV-394-CWR-LRA

RALPH H. BARLOW, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

The Court requests supplemental briefs, from each side, that address the following questions:

1. Who drafted the agreement to arbitrate?
2. Did any of the defendants seek to negotiate, or in fact successfully amend, any term in the agreement to arbitrate?
3. What weight, if any, should the Court place on the plaintiffs' choice to not request an explained decision on the statute of limitations issue?
4. To what degree did Judge Weill's summary judgment opinion in *Baker* deviate from the proposed opinion plaintiffs' counsel sent to his chambers? Is it correct that (a) our arbitration was pending when *Baker* was decided, and (b) our arbitration is being litigated by the same plaintiffs' counsel who drafted the proposed opinion in *Baker*?
5. Why was *Baker* not resolved in arbitration?

Supplemental briefs of no more than 10 pages shall be filed electronically on August 23, 2019.

No response briefs will be considered.

SO ORDERED, this the 14th day of August, 2019.

s/ Carlton W. Reeves
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE